



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/614,331

07/03/2003

John Eugene Allamon

ARIBP068

8022

21912 7590 03/10/2008
VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200
CUPERTINO, CA 95014

EXAMINER

HAYLES, ASHFORD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3687

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Final Office action in response to communications received January 5, 2008. Claims 12-13 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15-17 and 20 have been amended. Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 7-9, 14, and 18-19 are pending and addressed below.

Response to Amendments

2. Applicant's amendments to the claims are sufficient to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejections and 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections set forth in the previous office action.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 21 depends from a preceding claim. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 22 depends from itself. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-11, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang (6,604,107) further in view of Aoki (PG PUB. 2001/0039531).**

As per Claim 1, 10, 11, and 20, Wang teaches a method for:

receiving at least one attribute of at least one item (Column 3, lines 15-20);
searching an electronic database (Column 7 lines 8-9) to compile an identified listing of items (Column 7, lines 26-28), wherein the database contains a listing of items (Figure 1, Database 23), each item in the listing of items having the at least one attribute (Figure 3, Generic Attribute Table 202); each attribute being common to a plurality of items in the listing of items, and wherein each item in the identified listing of items has the at least one received attribute (Column 4, lines 2-9); an index of the total number of items per each identified attribute (Figure 6, Attribute Position 606); displaying the generated lots in an organized manner (Figure 6, Attribute Map Table 208).

However, Wang fails to disclose creating a lot having a plurality of items, generating a lot listing from the identified listing of items, wherein the generated lot listing indicates a plurality of items to be auctioned as a lot in an electronic auction.

Wang and Aoki are within the same field of online auctioning. Aoki teaches creating a lot having a plurality of items (¶ [0052], lines 65-67 discuss when exhibiting multiple items, an operation to group the multiple items i.e., exhibiting as the grouped items), generating a lot listing from the identified listing of items (¶ [0057], lines 46-49 discuss multiple items are collectively subject to auction as grouped items, individual items composing the grouped items are listed in the item introduction field), and wherein the generated lot listing indicates a plurality of items to be auctioned as a lot in an electronic auction (Figure 4B, Display Field 430).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the generic attribute database system of Wang to include the auction system and program as taught by Aoki to be able to group multiple similar items in a group to be auctioned.

As per Claim 2 and 14, Wang teaches, wherein the electronic database comprises an attribute-based electronically searchable list of a plurality of attributes (Column 5, lines 63-67 through columns 6, lines 1-6).

As per Claim 3, Wang teaches wherein the identified listing of items comprises an index of the total number of items per each identified attribute (Column 3, lines 2-5).

As per Claim 4 and 15, Wang further teaches wherein the generating further comprises grouping items with similar characteristics and prices (Column 5, lines 50-52).

As per Claim 5-6 and 16-17, Wang teaches wherein a plurality of attributes are received and the generating comprises selecting the items in the lot listing having all or any of the identified attributes (Column 3, lines 14-20 via an automobile will have some or all of the identified attributes).

As per Claim 7, 18 and 21, Wang teaches at least one attribute comprises at least one of an operation, material, fabrication, process, tolerance, size, weight, specification and any other feature of a part (Column 1, lines 29-30 via size as a displayed attribute).

As per Claim 8, Wang teaches displaying the generated lots in a formatted manner (Figure 6, Attribute Map Table 200).

As per Claim 9, 19, and 22, Wang teaches that items to be auctioned comprise at least one of parts, materials, and components (Column 3, lines 51-62).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/05/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashford S. Hayles whose telephone number is 571-270-5106. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 8:30 to 4:00 Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Gart can be reached on (571) 272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew S Gart/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625

AH